



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/574,840 | 01/19/2007 | Hideki Kitano | Q94324 | 5035 |
| 23373 | 7590 | 08/09/2011 | EXAMINER | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC | | | VERDERAME, ANNA L | |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. | | | | |
| SUITE 800 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | 1722 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/09/2011 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Advisory Action</i> <i>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</i> | Application No. 10/574,840 | Applicant(s) KITANO ET AL. |
| | Examiner ANNA VERDERAME | Art Unit 1722 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-15.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Applicant argues that despite the fact that Kitano discloses, within the reference, the addition of the same tackifiers as applicant in amounts sufficient to improve the processing properties of the adhesive that one of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in blind trial and error to arrive at applicant's invention. This is unconvincing. Kitano discloses a goal, improving processing properties among which is included the laminating properties of the adhesive, and that the specific tackifiers, including once taught by applicant are used for this purpose. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would optimize the amount of the tackifier to achieve this goal. Just because the specific processing properties, bleeding etc., are not specifically mentioned by Kitano does not mean that the adhesive composition formed by Kitano does not also have these properties. Applicant has to show that the adhesive compositions rendered obvious by the Kitano reference do not inherently also have the properties recited in the instant claims. Applicant argues that despite the fact that Kitano discloses, within the reference, the addition of the same tackifiers as applicant in amounts sufficient to improve the processing properties of the adhesive that one of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in blind trial and error to arrive at applicant's invention. This is unconvincing. Kitano discloses a goal, improving processing properties among which is included the laminating properties of the adhesive, and that the specific tackifiers, including once taught by applicant are used for this purpose. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would optimize the amount of the tackifier to achieve this goal. Just because the specific processing properties, bleeding etc., are not specifically mentioned by Kitano does not mean that the adhesive composition formed by Kitano does not also have these properties. Applicant has to show that the adhesive compositions rendered obvious by the Kitano reference do not inherently also have the properties recited in the instant claims. Applicant points to example 5 and comparative example 2 as showing unexpected results. Example 5 contains tackifier and comparative example 2 does not. Kitano clearly motivates one of ordinary skill in the art to add tackifier to achieve positive results and applicant has not shown that any certain range of tackifier content provides the results the applicant's claim including reduced bleeding. 2

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| | /Martin J Angebranndt/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1722 |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------|

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20110801